

REMARKS

Claims 7-9, 11, 12 and 15-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 are amended, claims 13 and 14 are canceled, without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein, and claims 23-28 are added. Support for amendments to claim 7 can be found at least in claims 13 and 14. Claims 8 and 12 are amended for form. Support for new claims 23 and 24 can be found at least in Figs. 1 and 2 and the corresponding description in the specification. Support for new claim 27 can be found at least in Figs. 3-8, and the corresponding description, in the specification, and new claim 28 can be found at least in Figs. 9-22 and the corresponding description in the specification. No new matter is added.

I. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**A. §103 Rejection Over Kuwahara In View of Okajima**

Claims 7-9, 11-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kuwahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,866) in view of Okajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,276). The rejection of canceled claims 13 and 14 are moot, and the rejection of claims 7-9, 11, 12, 15 and 19-22 are traversed.

Kuwahara and Okajima, alone or in permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 7-9, 11, 12, 15 and 19-22. None of the applied references teaches or suggests "the electrophoretic particles in the first cell being colored to a first color so as to reflect the first color to reach a viewer and electrophoretic particles in the second cell being colored a second color so as to reflect the second color to reach the viewer, the first color being different from the second color, each of the electropherical particles being colored only one color," as recited in independent claim 7. Further, none of the applied references teaches or suggests "the particles being colored a first color so as to reflect a color to be reached to a viewer, each of the particles being colored only one color," as recited in claim 19.

Kuwahara discloses a small sized two-color ball of electrophoretic particles, each of which is composed of a pair of hemispherical portions are different from a each other in terms of color and charging characteristics (Kuwahara, Abstract). Thus, Kuwahara does not disclose providing a particle so as to reflect a corresponding color to reach a viewer, as recited in independent claims 16 and 19.

Further, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Kuwahara does not teach or suggest particles being colored only one color. Okajima does not remedy Kuwahara's deficiencies. Okajima merely discloses a plasma display, and not an electrophoretic display (see Abstract in Fig. 1, Okajima). Thus, the fluorescent material used in Okajima's display is totally different from a particle according to the claimed invention that is suspended in fluid, i.e., dispersion medium, and that is capable of migrating between electrodes in response to an applied voltage. Thus, for at least these reasons, Okajima does not disclose particles that are dispersed in a dispersion medium, as recited in claims 7 and 19.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 19 patentable over Kuwahara and Okajima. Further, claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 20-22, which variously depend from claims 7 and 19, are also patentable over Kuwahara and Okajima for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Rejection of Claims 16-18

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kuwahara in view of Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,896)¹. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests, alone or in permissible combination, an electrooptical device that includes a cell containing a plurality of microcapsules, each micro-capsule including "the first particle and the second particle being colored the first color and the second color, respectively, so as to reflect corresponding colors to be reached to a viewer, the first color and second color being complementary, and a charge of the first particle being inverse of a charge of the second particle," as recited in independent claim 16, and as similarly recited in independent claim 18.

As discussed above, Kuwahara discloses a small sized two-color ball of electrophoretic particles. Thus, Kuwahara does not teach or suggest the first particle and the second color particle being colored the first color and the second color so as to reflect the corresponding colors to reach a viewer, as recited in independent claims 16 and 18.

Further, the Office Action acknowledges that Kuwahara does not disclose a first color having a charge that is inverse of the charge of a second particle. Furthermore, Ikeda does not remedy Kuwahara's deficiencies. Ikeda does not teach or suggest a single cell including both positive and negative charges. In Ikeda, the particles that are caused to migrate parallel to the surface of an electrode by a applied electrostatic force, and perpendicular to the surface of the electrode by applied magnetic force, are positively or negatively charged (see col. 3, line 45 - col. 4, line 36 of Ikeda). Ikeda does not disclose providing both positively charged particles and negatively charged particles in a single cell. Thus, Ikeda does not disclose a cell having a

¹ The Office Action refers to Yamaguchi in the rejection over Kuwahara and Ikeda. Applicant assumes that this is a typographical error as Yamaguchi was disqualified as prior art under §102 in the July 16, 2007 Amendment. Thus, Applicant assumes all references to Yamaguchi in the rejection are to Ikeda, and traverses the rejection accordingly.

plurality of particles wherein a charge of the first particle is an inverse of a charge of the second particle, as recited in claims 16 and 18.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 16 and 18 are patentable over Kuwahara and Ikeda. Further, claim 17, which depends from claim 16, is also patentable over Kuwahara and Ikeda for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBImrh

Date: November 30, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|